MEETING SUMMARY

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN UPDATE 2013
WORKSHOP: CALIFORNIANS WITHOUT SAFE WATER REPORT
9:00 AM - NOON
815 S STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA

Meeting Objectives

- Provide overview of the report on Californians without Safe Water and Sanitation
- Discuss and provide input to further develop key content.

Welcome and Overview

A workshop was held on April 9, 2013 to discuss the working draft of the *Californians without Safe Water and Sanitation* Report (Report). Lisa Beutler, Facilitator, reviewed the agenda and materials for the workshop. Introductions were made around the room and on the webinar.

Lewis Moeller, DWR, Update 2013 Project Manager welcomed everyone, noting that this will be an important discussion. The Report has not been updated since it was first released in 2005. Jose Alarcon, the Water Quality Lead for Update 2013 has taken the responsibility for this update. Mr. Moeller explained that the Water Plan consists of several volumes. The Report will be available as a stand-alone document, and will also be contained in Volume 4 of the Water Plan Update 2013. It was further noted that Volume 1 of the Water Plan has an Implementation Plan for addressing a variety of objectives and the associated related actions. Objective 13 addresses ensuring equitable distribution of benefits. That objective could be influenced by this Report. Underserved communities and environmental justice issues will also be discussed in the chapter on California Water Today (also in Volume 1). Volume 2 of the Water Plan will contain the Regional Reports, which describe specific regional conditions. Volume 3 contains the Resource Management Strategies. Material from the Report could be located in several areas of the Water Plan, including the sections on technology and data and analysis.

Jose Alarcon remarked that the team is looking for content for a few areas of the Report. In 2005, the Report focused safe water. The content is now being expanded to cover sanitation. The initial meeting to discuss the update for the report was in 2012, with a recent presentation to the Water Plan State Agency Steering Committee. Input is now being sought for the sections relating to challenges, actions and recommendations - including those that are thematic. In terms of sources, there is a lot of information available. The Water Boards have a Small Water System strategy. For drinking water, there is the nitrate report and AB2222 (Communities Reliant on Contaminated Groundwater), Small Water Systems Plan (Department of Public Health [DPH]). It is difficult to obtain information on water quality for systems that are not regulated.

This Report will document the work that has been done, and describe the actions and recommendations to help these communities. It will identify where the need is, what the problems are, and what needs to be done to achieve good outcomes. Efforts need to focus on actions to improve conditions. The Water Plan does influence legislation and actions by others.

Initial Discussion

Definition of Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

- There must be a balance in describing the needs of rural and urban communities. Urban areas often have underserved communities that are lost in census tracks. We do not was to disenfranchise smaller urban communities, that also need assistance.
    - It was noted that state regulations do not require that disadvantaged communities be defined by census track. The State Water Boards offer an alternative to the census track approach, by using an income survey.
    - Some of the areas might be lost, even in an income survey. Also, income surveys can be prohibitively expensive. This is a good opportunity to inform statewide approaches, and income survey guidelines.
- Much of the descriptive information, which is very helpful, may sacrifice emphasis on the actions and recommendations. The actions and recommendations would benefit from being further developed.

Description of the Problem

- There was a question as to why the Report is limited to small communities. One of the primary uses of the Water Plan is as a reference document. The Water Plan is an authoritative and objective document developed by the state. The most important thing (even beyond recommendations) is identifying and documenting the problem. The State doesn't have a good handle on the problem, of how many disadvantaged communities there are and where they are located. The problem could be further described, to get the full story out. There are schools that don't have safe water. There is data that can be pulled. It was suggested that getting the full story out is what's most important. Regionally, that information needs to be displayed on maps and broken out by county.
    - There are both small water systems and private wells using water from contaminated aquifers. That needs to be mentioned.
    - Additional information has been developed by the Governor's Drinking Water Stakeholder Group. No documentation is provided on systems with less than 15 connections, schools, trailer parks, etc. Furthermore, the data on systems with 15 and more connections is severely lacking for the Tulare Lake Basin and the entire State.
    - There are political issues that make it difficult to address this issue. In Maywood, 75% of the residents are renters and they do not have a vote in the mutual water company. It's the absentee landowners who are making decisions about water quality. The residents don't have a vote or a voice about water decisions. Access to clean water is as much about politics, as it is chemistry and engineering.
    - The Water Boards' Nitrate Report includes a recommendation to address those systems that lack the technical, managerial and financial (TMF) capacity to operate properly.

Walk-through of Document

Mr. Alarcon explained that the organization builds on the structure of the 2005 Report, focusing on small communities and Tribal communities.

Introduction

This section discusses the definitions of small communities, which are different for water supply and wastewater. For drinking water, the level is 1,000 connections. For wastewater, it is for communities of up to 20,000 people (this was obtained from the Water Boards small system strategy).

The introduction needs to explain the background, purpose, and the context for which this Report is being updated. There is much that has changed since 2005. The introduction also needs to provide definitions. It may be that the definition is specific to the document.

- This leaves out community like Maywood, where there is a population of 25,000.
- Community size doesn't determine whether or not there is safe water.
- If a community is defined by average attributes – affected households and individuals can be lost. If the level of analysis is the number of affected households, rather than the communities that are affected, that would inform the definitions. Is anything being lost by having the unit of analysis be these defined communities? If the attributes are averaged, that may also lose sight that 5% of the households are drinking bottle water. Is the data available for using a different level of analysis? It may be that the report would flag that some affected households may be missed by the way the data is compiled and analyzed.
- There was a question as to whether a DAC is the same as a small DAC.
- The emphasis on rural communities loses urban communities that may be several disadvantaged. The statements made about small, rural DACs could also be said for pockets of poverty in large urban areas. Maywood is serviced by three small mutual water companies. People would be surprised to see how many areas are served by mutual – within a larger metropolitan area, such as in the Santa Ana area.
- How does the Report define "without safe water" and "without safe sanitation"? This could help address some of the questions. Defining it by the water provider gets to the different types of providers (private wells, mutual, single providers, etc.). What standards are being used to define "safe water"? Is it exceeding primary drinking water standards? If so, that doesn't address secondary standards, which may result in water being undrinkable. It also doesn't address constituents for which standards have not yet been established. Affordability is another issue. You don't have safe water if the water has been shut off due to non-payment. How do we define "without safe water" (or sanitation)? How do we define "Californians" – by households or the community?
- It was suggested that definitions should wrap around the service provision scale. The individual districts know their hookups and the data is available to understand (at a very

fine scale) which hookups are receiving what source water. The finest grain is then the individual connection. Information at the census track scale will create a boundary problem, since the "community" may not match what is going on with the pipes. It might help to describe that it's easier to define communities from an income basis (and you deal with those issues there), while the service scale is different.

- The definitions of safe water and sanitation will be included in the introduction. Safe water it being defined by primary standards. For the systems regulated by DPH or the counties (15 connections or more), if the source doesn't meet primary standards, then the whole community is determined to be affected by unsafe water.
    - Are we going to focus on what people are actually drinking (what's coming out of their tap) or what's coming out of the well? The information for systems with fewer than 15 connections may not be available. There might be aquifer information to help get at water quality.
    - It was noted that the Report doesn't focus on which wells are contaminated – it looks at the water being served (so it might be blended or treated). If any water from the system fails, then the whole community is listed (even though part of the service area may be receiving safe water supplies). This is based on the DPH approach.
    - Access and safety issues need to be defined in terms of users (not sources). A discussion about risk v. exposure can explain that risk is associated with the water source, and exposure is associated with water quality at the tap.
    - Explain that even though water at the tap may be in compliance for primary drinking water standards, the water may not be drinkable (due to secondary standards) or it may not be affordable. Primary standards don't address constituents that lack standards.
- A big part of this is education. Even if it's not possible to answer all the questions, the Report can frame what the conversation should be. The introduction should set out of the scope of the information: what we can get our hands around this time, and what still needs to be done (describe limitations). Sometimes the data gaps are the story.
    - Check in with the CPUC Ratepayer Advocate DAC-EJ section.
- Some of the constituents – such as PCP and nitrates – make it so that the water can't be used for non-consumptive household activities. People can get very sick from exposure (laundry, washing dishes, showers). The goal is to mitigate the pollution and the damage that's occurring in the state and the spread of contaminations.

The Need

This section describes who is not receiving safe water supplies or who lacks adequate wastewater facilities. The goal was to provide a number of communities not adequately supplied with safe drinking water or sanitation.

Drinking Water

The DPH small water system program plan identifies 168 small systems (about 55,000 people) without safe water. This does not include private wells and state smalls not included in here. Is there information on state smalls?

The framework currently focuses on small community water systems that violate one or more health-based standards.

- Identify all community water systems (including larger systems) that violate any primary health-based standard;
    - Categorize the results by size, by DAC, by county, by hydrologic region
- Include systems that violate secondary standards (DPH has info)
    - Break out different communities (including non-transient non-communities such as schools and work places), communities (by size, whether DAC, by county, by hydrologic region)
- Discuss unregulated contaminants (chrom 6 and 123 CP) in terms of the notification limit or public health goals. Manufacturers produce 10,000 new chemicals – there are studies of constituents of emerging concern. This would focus on those with a notification limit or a public health goal.
- Discuss affordability (this is a hard issue). How many people don't have safe water because of affordability?
- Who doesn't have safe water because of safe infrastructure problems? Schools and areas with inadequate housing may have lead pipes.
- Discuss State and local smalls (5-14 hookups and 2-4 hookups, respectively) – this information has to be requested from each county.
- Private, domestic wells (commercial?)

Do want to include transient, non-community (businesses such as truckstops)? That could be included in here. The non-transient, non-community category includes permanent locations like schools, workplaces and farm sources). (There's a number – if there are less than "x" number of repeat users, it is considered non-transient.)

Risk

In an earlier section, there could ground description of risk. Provide an example to illustrate risk factors: If an area is using blending, contaminated wells provide a risk during drier years (when there is less water to blend with, and the risk of exposure is higher). Look at risk from potential contaminants that are on their way, or how risk from blending situations when cleaner supplies (e.g. surface water supplies) are reduced.

Additionally, think about cumulative risk assessment rather than a contaminant-by-contaminant risk assessment. What communities are likely to be affected by one or more contaminants? Also, look at more than violating a standard – to the degree of violation (level of exceedance), which affects exposure.

Consider addressing the **cost-benefit pathway**. The providers are failing to serve safe water. Often that is because the water source has been contaminated by contributions from particular sources. Cost burdens should be allocated to the responsible parties when possible.

- The #1 recommendation from the Water Boards' report is to NOT lay the costs solely on small communities.
- Counties allowed septic tanks that are now failing and the counties have not been named as responsible parties. There are responsible parties for many of these situations. Small communities didn't cause the problem but have to clean up the mess.
- There are anthropogenic effects that affect the safety of water supplies: nitrates cause people to dig wells deeper and thereby increase exposure to arsenic. Mining can also free up arsenic. There is some cause-and-effect with human behavior.

Describe the different level of impacts – water unusable for drinking water, full-body contact, household activities, etc. Discuss through case studies. This can help you discuss regional issues. Even though the information may not be available for this level of analysis, the description will help tell the story.

For drinking water, there may be some data relating to risk and exposure. The AB222 report identifies communities impacted by contaminated wells. For risk metrics, you can look at:

- the wells that are increasingly contaminated
- # of systems with a contaminant (e.g., when ½ way to MCL, you need to start monitoring, could be an indicator of risk).
- the number of systems with 1 or 2 wells (these systems are the most vulnerable)
- cumulative impacts (contact California Enviro screen) (level and time of exposure, # of sites – e.g school and home)
- it might be helpful to link to Chapter 5 (Volume 1) of the Water Plan, regarding indicators

It would be helpful to provide a range of how many people do not have access to safe water. This would provide a sense of scale. The current estimate is from DPH. The number of people relying on contaminated aquifers might be traceable with GAMA. (There was a Sierra Foothills study for GAMA.) It would be helpful if the Report could document data gaps and the vulnerabilities of people relying on that water.

- This is a good conversation to frame the discussion. There isn't time for new analytical data. It might be possible to re-evaluate existing data. The data gaps can flag the additional work needed to inform the recommendations.

- AB222 and DPH have developed a lot of information on this. Environmental screen also has data.
- Dr. John Faust (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment) can provide information on Enviro Screen.
- If there are sources that can provide findings, that would be helpful.

Sanitation

Much of this information came from the small community wastewater strategy.

- There are larger communities that can't afford upgrades. The Water Boards' State Revolving Fund has options for principal forgiveness. The metrics look at populations of less than 20,000 with less than 80% median household income, and also looks at utility rates criteria.
- It was noted that there are failing septic tanks in urban areas (e.g. Pomona), and the report needs to be cognizant of that. California is an agricultural and rural state – even though we now look urban. Public agencies can only do so much. Talking to residents will help identify problems.
    - When going out to talk with the community, it is very important to keep in mind the political access to impacting the water system. The IRWM will sometimes say that can't work with you, because they work for the city council. If the city council doesn't represent the affected area, there is no voice for impacting the water system. What's the political ability of a community to impact their water system? If you don't have that, you don't have the political will to make the water clean, affordable and accessible.
    - Water Boards will send comments to Jose regard the text on septics systems, which references the State Boards efforts.
    - It would be helpful to map out the approximate location of septics, by hydrologic region or by county. This would help increase awareness of septic issues. The information, if available, would be with the Water Boards' septic policy.
    - Showing that there are septic issues in Southern California might help generate greater political will.
    - There may be a strong link between affordable drinking water and wastewater services. As we seek solutions for small drinking water systems their size becomes a consideration. Out of this the discussion now includes consideration of consolidation of systems to create more fiscally efficient entities that are affordable (or at least more affordable) by DACs -- there are good examples in New Mexico. Incorporating both drinking water and wastewater (small treatment systems or septic tank districts) into the discussion may provide the opportunity to create even greater fiscal feasibility for providing both competent drinking water and wastewater services for DACs -- scale is important as it spreads costs such as operators, administration and billing services, parts inventory, etc.

- There could be discussion on different levels of treatment (secondary and tertiary). There are also hybrid systems – septics that feed into a cesspool (there are examples in Coachella), or septics with liquids also going into sewer lines.
- The Water Boards have levels of treatment for larger systems. The information on smaller systems may be lacking. The Water Boards would be interested in learning about that. Between the septic tanks and larger systems – there are other situations that may not be monitored.
- In the Central Valley, most wastewater systems provide secondary treatment and they should be moving towards tertiary. In California, tertiary treatment for wastewater is filtered (to address pathogens). Nitrification-denitrification is where we need to be going in nitrate-heavy areas. This is more common in Southern California.
- Is the need about lack of infrastructure? Are the needs relevant to public health?
- In the Central Valley, one of the wastewater issues is the lack of capacity to serve more households. Almost every system is at a capacity moratorium, where they can't serve any more growth or economic development. This type of information is hard to get at. Where there is regional data (county data or local projects), it would be good to provide that. For example, there is the Tulare Lake Basin DAC water and wastewater survey.
- The Water Boards are doing a rate survey. There is a mid-April deadline. The goal is to have some information by later in the summer.
- Most of the Water Plan deals with and acknowledges climate change. In one of the recent Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) surveys, half the respondents thought that climate change would impact their future drinking water supplies. It would be worth describing here, in the looking ahead section, to talk about the role that availability will play in access to safe drinking water. It's a current and future problem.
    - Also, many wastewater treatment plants are located in coastal areas.
    - The floodplain issue also includes land use planning where low income areas are situated at low elevations.
    - Risks address several aspects: climate change, aging infrastructure and affordability.
- Is there a way to recycle contaminated waters (such as those associated with septics), instead of sending it back to the aquifer?
    - Idlewild water district came in with a water recycling planning effort, and is currently looking at feasibility. This district has three small systems. Water Boards' could write a brief paragraph of small systems applying for planning grants to assess the feasibility of water recycling.
    - The Water Boards is looking into conducting a one-day workshop on nitrate treatment technology (for both drinking water and wastewater treatment). Brine disposal and O & M costs will be part of the discussion. It was noted that denitrification processes could be used with secondary treatment.

- The Water Technology Caucus has been discussing drinking water research needs. Everyone seems to talk about data management and the difficulty in accessing databases, and the variation in data quality. It would be helpful to discuss that here. We need to identify data gaps for DACs (for drinking water and sanitation), including those under 15 connections and for schools and trailer parks.
    - There is a need for small-scale, decentralized water and wastewater treatment systems. Investment in new research and technology can help make that more cost-effective. That could be a large part of the solution.
    - There are low-tech options for wetlands treatment of wastewater, such as in Arcata.

Challenges Faced by Small Disadvantaged Communities

This encompasses challenges associated with drinking water or sanitation – and there may also be inter-connected challenges. This section discusses barriers to addressing the needs.

- The financial challenges are framed as problems that the communities have to resolve. That puts all of the financial burden on those communities – O & M costs, and qualifying for capital improvement funding. The idea of polluter pays needs to be included. We need to look at where the contamination is coming from.
- There are communities where the water bills went from $25/month up to $100/month. The distribution of revenue includes 45% going to the County, which owns the facility. There are contaminants from synthetic fertilizers. Going back to the 1930s, there has been contamination and exploitation of natural resources – with none of the profits going back into the community.
- A case study on Kashia discussed that advanced technology exceeded the ability of operators to sustain. Appropriate technology is a better word.
- For section 4.1, common challenges, there needs to be sections on:
    - the lack of adequate data,
    - the accessibility of data,
    - cost burdens, and
    - political challenges.
    - There needs to be a discussion on funding for low-income homes and schools – this could go under aging infrastructure.
    - The issues of affordability and financial capacity should be separated. There are financial and operational considerations relating to O & M and the technical and managerial challenges. Affordability is related, but it's experienced differently by the individual household. There are different strategies to address these. E.g., for affordability, there could be life-line rates for households. For technical, financial and managerial issues the strategies would focus more on economies of scale, or providing capacity building for small systems.

- There are options for centralized management that provides economies of scale, without being connected by pipes. The idea of regionalization and scaling up small systems doesn't necessarily involve infrastructure.
- There is a lot to discuss regarding government funding. Highlighting barriers to the access of funding is important. For example, non-public water systems don't qualify for the State Revolving Fund. Much of that has been developed through the Governor's Stakeholder Group. There are documents that have been developed through this group and the Tulare Basin DAC Water and Wastewater Study. The Tulare Basin study provides a list of challenges identified by the Stakeholder Group. There is also a list of promising solutions.

Matching Water Quality to Use

- It was noted that different water uses (for example, drinking, cooking, bathing, firefighting, irrigation) have different water quality needs. Yet, we supply the highest quality water (drinking water) for all domestic purposes. Drinking water comprises about 1% of all water use.
- Matching water quality to use also works within the context of thinking about climate change and affordability. In the Salinas Valley, there's not enough recharge. The water this is currently available water is increasingly contaminated.
- This brings up interesting issues relating to decentralization. One experiment is to distribute lower quality water through the pipes. Every household would have the ability to reach drinking water quality through a decentralized system. What are the costs and unintended consequences of that?
    - Would there be discharge issues if reverse osmosis was used? (Similar to how water softeners at the household level increase salinity issues.)
    - Technology is more than the infrastructure. It's also the systems and processes needed to support that. There are also sociability aspects.
    - Decentralization can also increase risks (and possibly exposure). The decentralized systems can fail and need to be tested and maintained.

Technical Assistance

- Septic systems have a role in managing wastewater. We have to do a better job at creating local jobs to train individuals how to inspect and monitoring their systems in order to reduce health threats, and keep the cost down for communities to have long term success at keeping systems managed.
    - Technical assistance is not always the solution when septics are failing. Sewering every community is not feasible. Other appropriate technologies need to be discussed. Providing technical assistance means overcoming language barriers and cultural differences when conducting training.
    - Providing technical assistance doesn't necessarily solve the problem.

- Technical assistance must be affordable.
- It was suggested to separate out technical, managerial and financial (TMF) capacity and the respective challenges.

California Native American Communities

This part of the report focuses on Tribal systems, and content was developed with contributions from members of the Tribal Advisory Committee.

Progress and Accomplishments

This can be discussed in the afternoon meeting of the DAC-EJ Caucus.

Implementation Challenges

These have not been identified and it would be helpful to hear what some of the categories should be.

Action Plan to Achieve Safe Water and Sanitation

This section reports on the recommendations contained in the various state plans and the Governor's Drinking Water Stakeholder Group. These recommendations are currently contained in the Appendix. It would be helpful to have discussion on which themes and recommendations one should be incorporated in the Report.

- Consider framing the recommendations around the most compelling opportunities or impediments, as was done with the Resource Management Strategies.
- Is there a strategic response to address the problem? Do we have tools that allow us to do a good job? We need a new way of doing things – which is using Integrated Water Management at the local and regional level to implement resource management strategies.

Role of State Government

- It would be helpful for this report to talk about the role of state government in reducing impediments or assisting with TMF. There are legacy problems, where polluters may not be around.
- Prop 218 is part of the governance considerations and can limit local options. There are state board recommendations (from the nitrate report) to identify better funding sources and around governance.
    - These are issues where the entity charged with water doesn't have adequate TMF to provide a safe supply. What's the alternative governance structure in those situations?

Key Themes

- Date acquisition and management; data gaps
- Definition of DACs and median household income surveys
- Affordability
- Operational
    - O & M
    - Technical
    - Managerial
    - Financial
- Rural and urban aspects (and consequences for solutions)
- At what point are we thinking about climate change responses and resiliency.
- Community capacity, governance and political access
- Governance aspects (local, regional and state levels); see Stakeholder Group recommendations
- Technical assistance and capacity-building; see Stakeholder Group recommendations
    - for communities
    - for service-providers
- Integrated planning and development of regional solutions – there is a question that needs to be addressed as to whether you lose power in creating a regional governance structure
- Small systems and individual wells are not regulated, nor is groundwater pumping
- Technology

Groundwater Extraction

- Large groundwater extractions are hard to monitor, address and manage.
- Can the state require information counties to report on levels of groundwater extraction from individual wells?
    - The California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) is limited to surface elevations and reporting cannot be mandated. There's a negative consequence, if DWR has to conduct monitoring. It doesn't address quantity or quality.
    - The Salinas Valley is flat, with alluvial fans, and water contamination is higher. Can we find the locations of independent wells, and the associated level of contamination and extraction?

- Well logs are supposed to be submitted to county and DWR. There is limited access to the well logs due to confidentiality. There are no requirements for monitoring. GeoTracker from the Water Boards provides information that has been voluntarily submitted.
- Ag waiver groundwater monitoring requirement is trying to get at. The amount of information turned in depends on the voluntary groundwater monitoring plan. That is part of the Central Coast Water Boards program.
- Jurisdictional boundaries (cities and counties) do not match groundwater aquifer boundaries.

Conclusions

The current placeholder text for this section consists of findings. Conclusions and findings can describe the foundational concepts that help describe the existing conditions and the magnitude of the problem. If someone were writing legislation, these would be the "whereas" statements. For example, this is not just a rural problem. There are real consequences to not addressing this. The CPUC has mentioned impacts to the state economic if infrastructure doesn't support rural communities. (The State needs people to live there.)

- There are people in every county in California that don't have access to safe water or sanitation. This is both a rural and urban concern.
  - There should be numbers – even if they are ranges or estimates. That would be a useful result for this report. Numbers can be used to highlight or minimize things.
  - There should be a discussion about the lack of data to quantify the number of individuals or households without safe water or sanitation.
  - Say that magnitude of problem is not well known because of the lack of data.
- The risk is greater than we thought. Even those with currently safe supplies and sanitation are at risk, due to degrading conditions.
- Climate change affects safe drinking water and sanitation.
  - Climate change will further stress drinking water quality and quantity.
  - Climate changes have already stressed
  - Create a text box to discuss examples of climate change
- This is a concern long-lasting and corrections are long-term approaches.
- Discuss vulnerability – who is most vulnerable?
  - DAC status and size
  - Number of (drinking water) sources
  - State smalls and individual wells are most vulnerable – construction requirements are not as strict, not as enforced; no one is monitoring water quality of these
  - Especially those located in known high-risk areas

- There needs to be a statement on affordability (for both rate and infrastructure)
- In some communities, decisions are made by those not directly affected by the decisions.
- We haven't been able to adequately identify DACs in the state. The tools aren't there to help these communities self-identify. The definition of DACs creates problems in how it has been applied.
    - There are challenges in obtaining adequate MHI.
    - Agencies do not use consistent definitions for DACs.
    - There is now one set of guidelines for MHI surveys from the Water Boards, USDA Rural Development and the Department of Public Health. Community block grants (under HUD) have a different set of guidelines and would require a separate report.
- The lack of groundwater regulation has effects for safe drinking water and sanitation.
    - There is regulation for point source contamination
- Provide funding statistics for drinking water and sanitation – including known funding needs.
    - Explain that no funding source pays for O & M.
    - Funding sources are limited for

Recommendations

- Consider asking counties to provide information on the next OPR annual survey.

Jeannette: State and domestic systems are limited also.

References
Are there any reports where findings can be extracted?

Next Steps

ACTION ITEM: Send out strategic policy recommendations from the Groundwater Caucus (to the DAC-EJ Caucus).

ACTION ITEM: Send out strategic policy recommendations from the Technology Caucus (to the DAC-EJ Caucus).

ACTION ITEM: Rethink the title and orientation of the document.

Attendance

In Room:

Kenia Acevedo, CRLA
Julie Alves, Resources Agency
Horacio Amequita, CRLA
Laurel Firestone, Community Water Center
Liz Haven, State Water Board
Maria Kennedy, Co-Chair, DAC-EJ Caucus
Gita Kapahi, State Water Boards
Jeanette Pantoja, California Rural Legal Assistance
Noe Paramo, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Julie Rizzardo, State Water Board
Tito Sasaki, Sonoma County Farm Bureau
Frasier Shilling, UC Davis

Jose Alarcon, DWR, Water Quality Team Lead
Tracie Billington, DWR, IRWM Financial Assistance Branch
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Manager, Statewide Integrated Water Management
Lew Moeller, DWR, Update 2013 Project Manager

Facilitation: Lisa Beutler MWH; Judie Talbot, CCP

Webinar

Holly Alpert, Inyo-Mono IRWM
Dan Askenaizer, Water Quality and Treatment Solutions
Raquel Ayala
Colin Bailey, Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
Jeff Kapellas, State Water Board
Tom Keegan, Dry Creek Rancheria
Victor Lopez, State Water Board
Karen McBride, Rural Community Assistance Corporation
Cynthia Naha, Kashia Band of Pomo Indians
Wendy Phillips, League of Women Voters
Leonardo Vilchis, Union de Vecinos
Betty Yee, Central Valley Regional Water Board

Lauma Jurkevics, DWR